

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

RECEIVED
DEC 23 2003
 SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.
 LEGAL DEPARTMENT

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
KENNETH M. MASSARONI
SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
5030 SUGARLOAF PARKWAY
LAWRENCEVILLE, GA 30044

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Deadline = 2/16/04

Applicant's or agent's file reference F-7597-PC		Date of Mailing (day/month/year) 16 DEC 2003
International application No. PCT/US02/40828		REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing
International filing date (day/month/year) 20 December 2002 (20.12.2002)	Priority date (day/month/year) 31 December 2001 (31.12.2001)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): H04N 5/91 and US Cl.: 386/68		
Applicant SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.		

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the opinion
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 *bis*.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 30 April 2004 (30.04.2004).

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703)305-3230	Authorized officer Bob Chevalier Telephone No. 703-306-0377
--	---

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US02/40828

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application:*

- ☐ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
 pages 1-20, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the claims:
 pages NONE, as originally filed
 pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 pages 21-23, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the drawings:
 pages 1-5, as originally filed
 pages 6, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
 pages NONE, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☒ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☒ the description, pages NONE
- ☒ the claims, Nos. 5, 9-10, 12-17, 29-47
- ☒ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US02/40828

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims 8, 13-14, 17-19	YES
	Claims 1-7, 9-12, 15-16	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims 8, 13-14, 17-19	YES
	Claims 1-7, 9-12, 15-16	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims 1-19	YES
	Claims NONE	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1-7, 9-12, 15-16 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Lane et al.

Lane et al discloses a video recording/reproducing apparatus that shows all the limitations recited in claims 1-2, including the feature of storing video stream containing dependent frames in memory (See Lane et al's Figure 10a, component 340), the feature of decoding a plurality of undecoded dependent frames corresponding to the video stream to create a decoded frame and outputting the decoded frame responsive to receiving a request for a trick mode of operation as specified thereof would have been present in Lane et al. Because, Lane et al discloses that subset of normal play data are being used as trick play data and that the normal play data would include interframe data. Therefore, the interframe data would be part of the trick play data reproduced during trick play operation. (See Lane et al's column 37, lines 56-67).

With regard to claims 3-6, the feature of the video stream including independent frame data as specified thereof is present in Lane et al. (See the intraframe data shown in the normal play data shown in column 31, lines 53-55).

With regard to claim 7, the feature of the P-frame data recited thereof is present in Lane et al. (See Lane et al's Figure 5).

With regard to claims 9-12, the feature of the undecoded dependent frames being determined on the type of the video stream as specified would have been present in Lane et al. (See Lane et al's column 51, lines 1-9).

With regard to claims 15-16, the feature of the fast play mode of operation as specified thereof is present in Lane et al. (See Lane et al's Figure 11, component 422).

Claims 1-19 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus the industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

NONE

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US02/40828

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.